

REMARKS

In response to the final Official Action mailed July 21, 2006, Applicants amend their application and respectfully request reconsideration. In this Amendment After Final, no claims are added or canceled so that claims 1-39 remain at issue. Claims 1, 8, 12, 14, 21, 25, 27, 34, and 38 are amended. No new matter has been added.

I. 35 U.S.C. § 102 Anticipation Rejection of Claims

The Examiner rejected claims 1-39 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) based upon a public use or sale of the invention by *Microsoft Excel 2000* (hereinafter “*Excel 2000*”) copyrighted by the Microsoft Corporation in 1999. That rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicants respectfully submit that *Excel 2000* fails to teach every limitation of claim 1 as amended. For example, *Excel 2000* fails to teach “determining automatically by a computer whether a reference to said second cell conforms to a predetermined syntax for entry into a formula in said first cell based on whether the predetermined syntax allows a cell reference in an active portion of the formula.” See page 16, lines 19-27 of the filed application. *Excel 2000* does not determine conformation to a predetermined syntax based on whether the predetermined syntax allows a cell reference in an active portion of the formula. Moreover, *Excel 2000* does not automatically terminate formula editing when such a determination is made. Thus, *Excel 2000* does not anticipate amended claim 1.

Claims 8, 12, 14, 21, 25, 27, 34, and 38 recite limitations similar to those of claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that *Excel 2000* does not teach all the limitations of independent claims 1, 8, 12, 14, 21, 25, 27, 34, and 38, and respectfully requests that the rejection to these claims be withdrawn.

Claims 2-7 depend from claim 1. Claims 9-11 depend from claim 8. Claim 13 depends from claim 12. Claims 15-20 depend from base claim 14. Claims 22-24 depend from base claim 21. Claim 26 depends from base claim 25. Claims 28-33 depend from base claim 27. Claims 35-37 depend from base claim 34. Claim 39 depends from base claim 38. Thus, each dependent claim should be deemed allowable for at least the same reasons as the base claim from which it depends.

Moreover, claims 13, 26, and 39 are also allowable because Excel 2000 fails to teach that the formula is a search query. The Examiner contends this limitation is taught by Excel 2000's "DATE" function in the screenshot on page 14. The Examiner asserts that this function returns a date-time code. However, returning a date does not teach or even suggest searching. Applicants respectfully submit that none of the selected screen shots show a search query.

II. Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicants submit that all claims are allowable over the cited prior art, and respectfully requests early and favorable notification to that effect.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: November 2, 2006

By:


A. Wesley Ferrebee
Registration No. 51,312

Customer Number: 58328
SONNENSCHEIN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP
P.O. Box 061080
Wacker Drive Station, Sears Tower
Chicago, IL 60606-1080
Phone: (202) 408-9214
Fax: (312) 876-7457